

Serial No. 10/708,386
Filed: 02/27/04
Page 7 of 9

Examiner: E. Cherry
Group Art Unit: 2872

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 were in the application as filed. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under various grounds of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 as well as objected to the claims and drawings based on various informalities. The rejections and objections are each respectfully traversed.

In this paper, Applicant has amended the claims as shown above to more particularly and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant believes to be his invention and not for the purpose of avoiding prior art. No new matter has been added by the foregoing amendments, full support therefor being shown in the drawings and specification as filed.

Claims 1-14, as amended where noted, remain in the application and are believed by the Applicant to be allowable. Further examination and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Drawing Objections – 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5)

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as allegedly failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) because they omit reference numeral 51. The Applicant has attached a replacement drawing sheet to this paper pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). It is believed that this corrected drawing completely addresses the Examiner's concerns with the drawings and the objection should be withdrawn and the drawings deemed accepted by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-14 are objected to because of the following alleged informality: the Examiner has asserted that the phrase "can be" renders these claims indefinite, because it is not clear whether the language following thereafter is a part of these claims. This objection is respectfully traversed. The Applicant has made an appropriate correcting amendment and, therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

Serial No. 10/708,386
Filed: 02/27/04
Page 2 of 9

Examiner: E. Cherry
Group Art Unit: 2872

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes a change to Figure 6. This sheet replaces the original sheet. In Figure 6, previously omitted element 51 has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Serial No. 10/708,386
Filed: 02/27/04
Page 8 of 9

Examiner: E. Cherry
Group Art Unit: 2872

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-5 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Drumheller (US 5,165,081). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Drumheller '081 discloses an auxiliary mirror which can be attached to an existing mirror by a spring-loaded pair of L-shaped brackets. This reference is simply not relevant to the Applicant's invention, which primarily relates to the development of a common frame and/or reflective element which can be used with the other frames and/or reflective elements of varying sizes. The Applicant has attempted to clarify his invention by the amendments to remove Drumheller '081 as a prior art reference for the purposes of advancing prosecution.

For example, in the case of a common frame used with reflective elements of varying sizes, the Drumheller '081 reference does not disclose a movable pivot mount or a movable actuator mount which allows the pivot and/or actuator to be repositioned on the frame to allow reflective elements of varying sizes having varying locations of mountings for the pivot and/or actuator mounts to be used with the common frame. The same applies in reverse for a common reflective element to be employed with frames of multiple sizes and having varying locations for the pivot and/or actuator mounts for interconnection to the common reflective element.

Claims 1-5 and 8-14 as amended define over the Drumheller '081 patent for the reasons set forth above and the Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection. As a result of the clarifying amendment set forth above, these claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drumheller '081. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has asserted that Drumheller '081 discloses the claimed invention as set forth in claims 6-7 except the first connecting element comprises two connecting elements. This rejection is now moot in light of the clarifying amendments set forth above. However, assuming for the case of argument that the asserted combination based upon Drumheller '081 could somehow be made, there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation to one of ordinary skill in the

Serial No. 10/708,386
Filed: 02/27/04
Page 9 of 9

Examiner: E. Cherry
Group Art Unit: 2872

art to make the combination as asserted.

Thus, claims 6-7 are allowable for the same reasons set forth with respect to claims 1-5 and 8-14 above and for the reasons set forth in this section as to the improper combination based upon claims 6-7 as amended.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, all claims remaining in this application are in condition for immediate allowance. It is submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable over the prior art of record. Early notification of allowability is requested.

If there are any remaining issues which the Examiner believes may be resolved in an interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

IAN BODDY

Dated: August 4, 2005

By:


G. Thomas Williams, Reg. No. 42,228
MCGARRY BAIR PC
171 Monroe Avenue, NW, Suite 600
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
616-742-3500

G0180422